Saara Patel

HUM Section B

Ms. Small

9 October, 2025

<div align="center">AI's Role in the Educational Setting</div>

Artificial intelligence, or AI, is growing unprecedentedly. While fan-favorite applications such as Netflix and Instagram took three and a half years and two and a half months, respectively, to accumulate one million users, AI chatbots, such as ChatGPT, took less than a week to achieve the same milestone (Source D). As this technology becomes increasingly prevalent and influential, the values of job industries have been threatened. However, this issue extends beyond adults. Children in school are actively trying to exploit ChatGPT, whether it be in English class, math class, or even small, frivolous tasks. Its influx of usage in the educational setting has sparked ethical concerns among school districts. They ask, "To what extent should AI programs like ChatGPT have a role in education?" Ideally, AI use should only be permitted with oversight from administrative staff in higher-level classrooms, such as high school or college, to ensure a balance between human creativity and artificial automation.

To begin, students in elementary school and middle school should be prohibited from using AI for learning, as it discourages the development of primary skills. For younger kids, especially those who are at the beginning of their academic careers, there should be a focus on understanding and practicing new concepts. At this stage, they cannot afford to become reliant on technology that will apply these skills for them without first gaining mastery of them. Otherwise, if students do not become comfortable using these skills, it will ultimately "create forgetfulness in the learners," who will generally know nothing (Source A). Failure to accumulate these core skills early on, and instead seeking shortcuts, will result in the exhibition of artificial knowledge of basic topics, such as mathematical operations or grammar usage, which are both used as building blocks for life. However, this perspective is not fully agreed on throughout

different districts. At MacKenzie and Andrew Price's Alpha School in Austin, there is an emphasis on embracing the future of technology. Here, "students spend a total of just 2 hours a day on subjects like reading and math, using AI-driven software, " and use an "adult guide to oversee the development of practical skills for the remainder of the day" (Rios). This schedule is detrimental to students as a whole, as it prioritizes practical skills over social ones. Typically, it is at these fundamental ages that we learn mannerisms, conversation skills, patience, and how to express ourselves. Instead, elementary and middle schoolers should set a precedent for hands-on learning. If this becomes a reality, kids will become captivated by the process of learning itself. As Robert Wong, Director of Product Management for Google, pointed out, "cheating [has] less to do with AI," and more with how well the "students [are] engaged in the class" (Source B). The study he presented poses a new goal of getting kids excited to explore new materials. How can we change the way teachers convey concepts to students in a way that is enthralling and thus memorable? The answer to this question lies in the idea that students should be learning through experimentation. They should ask themselves, "If I change this, what happens to that?" Furthermore, because younger children start at similar academic baselines and are mostly focused on learning applicable algorithmic methods, like long division, there is limited usage for personalized assistance from a chatbot. Ultimately, AI usage hinders younger children from attaining baseline skills both practically and socially, and remains unnecessary for a population of students driven by natural curiosity.

That being said, high school students who have shown mastery in foundational skills should be permitted to integrate AI in their academics as a resource to enhance their preparedness, accessibility, and comprehension. Debatably, a school's purpose is to prepare its students for the future. As AI becomes increasingly prevalent, there is little use in ignoring its potential. Our current approach is flawed. Teachers should not be "[treating] students like enemies," and instead, they should be using AI "for the betterment of humanity" (Source A). By ridding AI as a resource, we would be eradicating a generation of a powerful tool that has the

aptitude to enhance the way material is taught and digested. Dismissing its implementation only deprives students of the ability to elaborate on and magnify their thinking. Nonetheless, many others, such as Allison Parshall, who holds a bachelor's degree in psychology, believe the use of AI will provoke dishonesty in kids, as studies have shown that "students [are] more likely to cheat when delegating to AI." Furthermore, some believe they will be ignorant of their dishonesty as long as they are not explicitly prompting AI to cheat for them. Although these studies raise valid concerns, they introduce no additional risk to learning. Students who are inclined to cheat will cheat regardless, while students devoted to their education will use AI as the tool that it is (Bonnin). As a whole, we must build mutual trust and recognise that "a student's motivation for learning is 90% of their success as a student" (Rios). The incentive to learn will always outweigh the temptation of misusing AI. With that established, one of AI's biggest strengths is its responsiveness. ChatGPT operates 24/7 and "has never said no" (Source C). Because of this, students rarely feel judged or embarrassed by its responses, as they feel that interacting with a bot is less intimidating than conversing with a teacher. Nevertheless, critics argue that the information AI yields to its users is inaccurate, thus, not a reliable outlet for students who do feel this way. American sociologist, Zeynep Tufekci, fed the bot tricky topics and declared that some of its answers were flat-out wrong. While this may seem like a deterrent, it is not. How many times have Google searches provided information that is outdated or incorrect? The answer is too large to count, but that does not mean the application should be banned as a resource. In fact, she mentions, we have "already been dealing with the internet's wealth of knowledge, along with its lies" (Source A). So, the key lies in how a student utilizes and assesses the information that is generated. While many educators forbid the controversial site, Wikipedia, from being cited in work, it is no secret that its popularity stems from its ability to connect to its audience and explain concepts in terms that are easy to process. Similarly, ChatGPT should be used to break down information and prompt understanding, making way for more complex applications. Due to the technology's growing influence,

independence from increased levels of cheating, readily available help, and the ability to foster the digestion of material, AI proves to be an advantageous utility.

Lastly, the stability of the academic responsibility, student voice, and a teacher's role in the classroom can only be upheld with a conscientious application of AI. Dana Goldstein, who works within educational administration, proposes new uses for AI. She says that "AI can be useful to teachers who would like to assign more writing, but are limited in their time to grade" as it eliminates a "human grading of writing [which is] prone to bias and error" (Source B). However, existing models that follow this idea have been proven inconsistent. A school in Dallas used AI-driven software to do just this, and they found that 43% of their grades had been compromised and lower than expected (Source B). In fact, AI teaches students to be uniform. Deter Green reflects and directly opposes Goldstein by saying, "Too often students are expected to follow a formula, to reliably mediocre results" (Source F). This teaches every kid to adhere to one standard blueprint. If this continues, what will differentiate us from the other twenty students in class, if not our self-expression and freedom to think independently? How can we encourage children to experiment and take risks if doing so would fail the static expectations of AI grading criteria? The short answer is, we can't. In her letter to ChatGPT, Olivia Han addressed these concerns when she writes that everyone will eventually "leave [their] own voices behind" and AI bots will "take away from [their] ability to challenge [themselves] and develop ideas that are truly original" (Source C). Though AI proves to be advantageous for trivial tasks, continued use melts away the ingenuity that belongs to students, until they are deprived of vital problem-solving skills. This, in turn, indirectly decreases the social efficiency of our society. Moreover, allowing full use of AI is counterproductive, as it leaves kids ill-prepared to apply to and attend college. First and foremost, they would present admissions staff with a false impression of themselves through the lack of character and inauthenticity in their writing. What really distinguishes them from other applicants? Even if their use of AI is undetected, upon arriving, colleges like NYU are expecting students to be "developing and

clarifying their own thinking" (Source E). Over-reliance on AI sets the stage for failure. In the long run, if used without limitations, AI inevitably substitutes a student's need to form opinions, depriving them of the opportunity to deepen them instead. As demonstrated, the human touch cannot be mimicked when work is offloaded to AI. The same principle holds, even more so, for activities that occur in class. Anant Agarwal states, "No algorithm can replace the empathy, creativity, and compassion a teacher brings to a classroom" (Source G). While ChatGPT can help bring these values together, it cannot be trusted to cultivate them independently. As a closing remark, he suggests that "this shift allows teachers to focus on what really matters," however, this should be taken with a grain of salt. We must remain cautious and be intentional about what tasks can be delegated to AI, ensuring that we preserve the human voice, which is the heart of learning. Therefore, AI should and can be integrated into schooling, but cannot fully replace humans in crucial areas of education, such as grading, writing, and teaching.

Students who have progressed far enough into their academic careers, where they practice application and not new skills, should be empowered to use AI, as long as the harmony between artificial intelligence and their own originality is moderated through the guidance of teachers. Therefore, even though this overbearing ethical question of "To what extent should AI programs like ChatGPT have a role in education?" is complex, the solution is clear. AI will continue to be a constant in our lives, and its presence has introduced valuable opportunities. However, these systems lack human guidance. Often, it is easy to succumb to the usage of these chatbots, but as a society, it is necessary to resist temptation. Otherwise, we risk this technology inevitably overtaking everything that is dusted with the fingerprints of our own thoughts. With all of this in mind, by agreeing to a mutual partnership with AI, we are promising communities high levels of social efficiency, which not only benefits children in schools, but also a larger demographic of people who will need to collaborate to create and maintain a coherent society.

**Citation Key:**

All lettered sources (A, B, C, D, E, F, G) are from the packet that we were supplied with.

Other external sources:

[A.I.-Driven Education: Founded in Texas and Coming to a School Near You](#)

[People Are More Likely to Cheat When They Use AI](#)

[Chat or cheat? Academic dishonesty, risk perceptions, and ChatGPT usage in higher education students](#)